

*Effect of proscriptive or extreme Legislation against Foreigners in
Massachusetts and New England, on Free Labor, Free States,
and the Cause of Freedom and Republicanism in the West.*

LETTER

OF

EDWARD L. PIERCE, ESQ.,

OF CHICAGO,

CONTAINING

IMPORTANT STATISTICS

IN REGARD TO THE

FOREIGN VOTE

AT THE

PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION.

TOGETHER WITH

EXTRACTS FROM THE REPORT OF THE MINORITY OF THE COMMITTEE OF
THE MASSACHUSETTS LEGISLATURE,

PRESENTING

Their Reasons for proposing a residence of two years after naturalization,
instead of fourteen years in the United States, before Foreigners
can acquire the right to vote and hold office.

BOSTON:
COMMERCIAL PRINTING HOUSE.
1857.

WAS FREMONT DEFEATED BY FOREIGN OR NATIVE BORN VOTES ?

THE vote for Fillmore in the Free States, was 393,590 ; and it is well understood that many Americans, both at the State and Presidential Elections in Pennsylvania, voted the Democratic ticket—enough, doubtless, to make the American vote for Fillmore and Buchanan over four hundred thousand. If these 400,000 votes, which were all given by *native-born* citizens, had been given for Fremont, he would have received the electoral vote of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Illinois and California, and have been elected.

Nobody can doubt, after reading the following letter from Mr. Pierce, that a much larger proportion of *foreign-born* voters withdrew from the Democratic party and voted with the Republicans for Fremont and freedom, after the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska bill, than of *native-born*.

By the census of 1850, the foreign population of Massachusetts, was.....	164,124
In the other free States, it was.....	1,702,273

Total in the Free States,.....1,866,397

Foreign population in the Slave States at the same time,.....378,205

Now let the most devoted friend of American principles, who is also a friend of Republican principles, ask himself, after reading the following pages, whether the good he hopes to accomplish—even if he could accomplish all he hopes—by extreme legislation against this handful of foreigners in Massachusetts, less than one-sixth of the whole population, will counter-balance the more than probable evils that will result from it, indirectly, to Republicanism in other States?

Chicago with a population more than half foreign, is the only city in the United States, having over 100,000 inhabitants, which gave a majority for Fremont over Buchanan and Fillmore. Ought foreign-born Republicans in that city, where, until lately, Douglas has been politically supreme, and would be now but for their votes—ought they to be deprived of the elective franchise, rather than native-born followers of that arch enemy of freedom and free principles? And would that promote Republicanism, and strengthen the power that is yet too weak to resist the aggressive policy of Slavery, and its purpose to extend the curse of its dominion and power?

31 Jan 24 g. Burton Hist. Collection.

5 Feb. '25 Smith

973.64
P61L

THE
LETTER.

Chicago, Ill., Jan. 26th, 1857.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE REPUBLICAN:

A few weeks since, tidings from Massachusetts filled us with alternate joy and sorrow. The almost unanimous re-election of Charles Sumner to the United States Senate was the occasion of exultant congratulation. In every republican household of the West, that great and good man is not only revered but loved. Men stopped each other on the streets in our city, saying, "Good. Massachusetts has done her duty nobly and well." Little did we expect that immediately upon that inspiring event, she would utter such discordant words by the voice of her Chief Magistrate. Your Senator in the autumn of 1855, in Faneuil Hall, pronounced a tribute to foreign-born citizens, denouncing a restriction of their civil rights as a reflection on "the distinguished living and the illustrious dead," which is among the finest passages he ever uttered, and will take a high place in the eloquence of the times. Immediately after he had received from the House of Representatives that emphatic and almost unanimous approval, your Governor pronounced before that body a libel on thousands of *foreign-born citizens*, who in the eventful struggle of November last rallied, a gallant and patriotic band, to the *standard of Freedom and Fremont*. He summoned the people of the old Commonwealth to pass constitutional amendments, imposing disabilities on this class, the passage of which would bring up one universal yell of *exultation* from all Douglassdom.

For the last two years, Douglas and his fellow-conspirators have attempted to prevent the stampede of foreigners from their thinning ranks, by ringing the changes on Know Nothing proscriptions, midnight councils, and especially, the riots of Cincinnati and Louisville. They have charged that in these last unhappy outbreaks, the native-born, led on by unscrupulous demagogues, assaulted with bloody violence the persons and homes of innocent and peaceable foreigners. If we may believe even the neutral newspapers of those cities, there was too much show of truth in these charges. The practical dissolution of the Know Nothing order, the pledge of the Philadelphia platform to resist proscription of this class, inserted at the instance of German delegates from the West, and the nomination of Fremont, who was known peculiarly to sympathize with that clause, and who had numbered among the heroic comrades of his explorations, the German, Preuss, have done much to remove their prejudice against the republican movement, which the resurrection of native Americanism and the riots of Cincinnati and Louisville, forever rung in their ears, had instilled into their minds, naturally enough, sensitive and suspicious.

Pass those amendments, and at once every Douglas demagogue and newspaper will repeat week after week and day after day, "Germans who voted for Fremont, look here, see what the Legislature of a State, which is almost unanimously Republican, which gave Fremont his largest majority, and which sent Charles Sumner back to the Senate, has just done! It has declared that you are not fit to vote or hold office, and shall not vote or hold office. *This is the act and creed of the Republican party, and what it will do in Illinois and in Congress, when it gets the power.* If you want self-respect and protection, your only hope is with us. The Sumners, Wilsons and Burlingames hate and will proscribe you. The Buchanans, Douglasses and Casses will protect you." Who will deny that there would be too much plausibility in such a plea? The other day, when some members of Congress voted for some native American measure, the names of the Republican members who voted for it were published here in the Douglas organ, the Times, with such comments, and Burlingame's name was printed in large capitals, as he had been conspicuous in the late canvass. *Already, the passages of your Governor's Address containing his attack on foreigners, have been translated into the German papers of Illinois, Wisconsin and other Western States which are upbraiding the Republican Germans for supporting the Republican party, whose doctrines, they say, are declared by Governor Gardner.*

It will be in vain that we attempt to parry the thrust by saying, as your Governor says in his message, that the amendments relate only to subsequent immigrants, and do not curtail existing privileges. They will recognize it, and rightly, too, as a deliberate attempt to lower the civil status of men on account of birth-place. You may argue long against such inferences, but the instincts of human nature are more unerring than reason. If the Legislature of Illinois should pass a law that future immigrants from New England should be required to pass a longer time in the State before becoming citizens, than immigrants from other sections, (supposing it to have the constitutional power to make such a discrimination,) every son of New England, now resident within her limits, would resent it, and rightly too, as a covert assault upon himself, and *would spurn the party which should endorse it.* It is in vain that you will tell them, as your Governor says, that this policy is inculcated by "the teachings of our early statesmen." They will triumphantly reply, the best teachings of the early statesmen are in their solemn legislative acts, and where they left this question, we only ask that it may rest. If those disabling amendments are to pass, we shall have no use in the next Presidential campaign for the voices of Wilson, Banks and Burlingame, for their presence would be a testimony against our cause with a strong and increasing body of our citizens, who are one of our chiefest reliances. Place them in the organic law of Massachusetts, and you will have the satisfaction of *postponing the triumph of freedom, four, eight, or twenty years, and God only knows when in the distant future, it will be achieved.*

Among the marked passages of your Governor's address, are the following:—

"Still, so far as the decision of the Presidential election is final, so far as the action of the present is inevitably developed in immeasurable and incomprehensible consequences and influences on the future, and so far as a step has been taken which it may require a generation to retrace, *our citizens have the bitter assurance of knowing that that decision has been made, that action fixed, that step*

taken, by the casting votes of alien born, aliens unnaturalized, and aliens entirely ignorant of our institutions and grossly callous to the vast interests involved in this stupendous issue.

"While this horde of foreign born voters has thus stricken down a noble cause, which appealed to the moral sentiment and enlightened patriotism of our country, it only affords another confirmation of a fact which our whole history establishes, that the foreign vote, with hardly an exception, always has been, and in the nature of things ever will and must be, attracted to that party which, under high-sounding generalities on the abstract rights of man, always practically co-operates with slavery at the South, and banishes from its platform the moral questions, and nobler instincts, and more enlightened sentiments of the age. All classes of aliens, both high and low, are absorbed, with few exceptions, into this extreme and self-styled progressive party, by laws of the human mind as inevitable as they are constant.

* * * * *

"With these prepossessions the foreigner lands upon our shores, and irresistibly attaches himself to the party bearing this name he has been taught to worship. So it has been, and so it ever will be. And it is this alien body which has decided in the past, many of our great national elections, and in the future, unless checked, is destined to thwart many of the noblest movements which New England, co-operating with the New England sentiments—morality and education—diffused through the great West, may undertake in behalf of freedom, humanity, and the nobler spirit of the century. It was the deadening influence of this body which counteracted the great Northern uprising of the last national election.

* * * * *

"Born and brought up under totally dissimilar principles of government, and accustomed to be led by the clannish influences which surround them rather than by enlightened individual responsibility, aliens are unfitted to appreciate or rightly use the great trust, in the exercise of which they are unwisely permitted to participate."

The statements which your Governor makes in the foregoing paragraphs are the opposite of truth. They are without facts and figures to sustain them, but are a part of the loose phraseology which is current among a class of persons who seek to degrade a portion of their fellow-citizens. Your Governor charges that "*all classes of aliens, both high and low, are absorbed, with few exceptions,*" into the party which elected Buchanan. No statement could be more "alien" to the truth than this, as will presently be shown. That in past times, and up to the passage of the Nebraska bill, foreigners generally joined the Democratic party, is admitted. But was that a crime? If so, it was the crime of John C. Fremont, Hannibal Hamlin, Nathaniel P. Banks, and hundreds of thousands of honest and liberty-loving Democrats, through the country. The writer of this confesses that crime. He was educated in that party to those principles of equality which are the universal right of every man, no matter whether "an Indian or African sun may have burned upon him," or under what sky God was pleased in his infinite wisdom to fix the home of his mother. But it is *flagrantly unjust to foreigners to charge upon them that they did not resist the extension of slavery*, when the intelligence and conscience of the native-born slept over the advancing wrong. But it will be remembered that, among the earliest protests against it, was that of the lamented Charles Follen, a German patriot, who maintained in America that inveterate hostility to slavery which made him an exile from his fatherland. The association with that good and brave heart is among the choicest memories of my childhood.

Your Governor charges that the election of Buchanan was effected by

"the casting votes of alien-born, aliens unnaturalized, and aliens entirely ignorant of our institutions." If, by this, he means that Fremont would have been elected, provided every foreign-born citizen had voted for him, it may be true. So also, it may be said if every native citizen had voted for him, he would have been elected. On the principles of your Governor's reasoning, the "casting votes" which decided the issue were given by native-born citizens,—and therefore, according to his logic, all native-born citizens should be disfranchised. This charge may be made with much more show of truth, against *natives* than against *foreigners*. It was Pennsylvania which particularly decided the issue of the recent election. And who decided the issue in Pennsylvania? It was the citizens who sustained Millard Fillmore, every one of them native-born, most of them intelligent, and therefore sinning against greater light than "aliens entirely ignorant of our institutions and grossly callous to the vast interests involved in this stupendous issue." On the Fillmore men of Pennsylvania, and particularly on the intelligent merchants of Philadelphia, who contributed their money to sustain the Fillmore divergence, rests the responsibility of that result, far more than on foreigners. *Will your Governor propose to disfranchise the citizens of Pennsylvania, who voted for Fillmore?*

The charge, just noticed, is a fair sample of the imputations which some persons are in the habit of casting on foreigners, which may equally be visited upon natives,—and which are often the frailties incident to human nature,—as if higher virtues were to be exacted of immigrants than of those born and educated on American soil.

The statements of your governor, that Buchanan was elected by "the casting votes of alien born, aliens unnaturalized"—that "this horde of foreign-born voters has thus stricken down a noble cause"—that "the foreign vote, with hardly an exception, always has been, and in the nature of things ever will and must be, attracted to that party"—that "which always practically co-operates with slavery at the South"—that "all classes of aliens, both high and low, are absorbed, with few exceptions," into this party—that "the foreigner irresistibly attaches himself" to this party—that "it is the deadening influence of this body which counteracted the great northern uprising of the last national election"—and that "aliens are unfitted to appreciate or rightly use the great trust, in the exercise of which they are unwisely permitted to participate," will now be considered. On the contrary, I affirm, and the census report, and the election returns will sustain me, that foreign-born citizens did not strike down a noble cause, that they did not, with only a few exceptions, vote for Buchanan, that the kindred statements are untrue or give a false impression, and that the charge that they gave the casting vote in the recent election has no application to them, any more than to natives. On the other hand, I affirm that the repeal of the Nebraska Bill was met with general reprobation by the German and Scandinavian foreigners throughout the West—that they rallied with *greater unanimity* than the *native* population to the support of the Republican cause—and although temporarily cooled in their ardor by the rise of the Know-Nothing order, on its subsidence they again returned to the support of that cause—that *but for their votes*, heretofore cast for the democratic party, Ohio, Wisconsin, Iowa, the State ticket in Illinois, and possibly the electoral ticket in Michigan, would have been lost to the Republican party; and but for their support the electoral tickets in Illinois and

Indiana would have been many thousands more in a minority—and, also, that *to them are we chiefly indebted* for whatever support freedom has received in Missouri, and particularly in St. Louis.

The foreign vote for Fremont in each of the north-western States will now be particularly noticed. The statements made are from reliable sources.

Ohio would have cast her electoral vote for Buchanan but for the foreign vote given for Fremont, *which in former presidential elections was cast for the democratic candidate*. Our majority in that State was between sixteen and seventeen thousand. At least one-half of the naturalized votes were cast for the Republican ticket. In the western districts, those of Mott and Nichols, they were the means of electing the Republican Candidates for Congress. Two-thirds of the Republican vote of Hamilton county, in which Cincinnati is situated, amounting to 9,345, was made up of foreigners. The mass of *native* votes, influenced by prejudice and by Southern trade, divided between Buchanan and Fillmore. In that county, Fremont made a *gain* of nearly five thousand over the gubernatorial vote of the Republican ticket in 1855, and of that increase *three-fourths* were naturalized Germans. In that county the Germans supported for member of Congress, a true Republican, while the natives either voted for the Nebraska man who was elected, or that traitor to freedom, John Scott Harrison, who was defeated. Our German vote in Ohio would have been much increased but for the recent agitation of Know-Nothingism.

In Indiana the Republicans had thirty-three per cent. of the foreign vote, —a smaller proportion than in any other western State. This was owing to the fact that the Maine law and native American resolutions have generally been introduced into the State platform. Yet even this ungenerous policy did not deter one-third of the foreign voters, so strong was their devotion to freedom, from voting for Fremont. But for that ungenerous policy, our friends would have nearly, if not quite, carried the State.

In Michigan, the foreign vote is not large. The Republicans received one-half of it, probably about 8000, *heretofore cast for the democrats*. This State, they would have carried, probably without the aid of the foreign vote, but if the Buchanan men could have relied on it in a body, they would have put forth desperate efforts to carry the State, and might have succeeded. As it was, with the large defection of Germans from their ranks, they had no hope and conducted the canvass tamely.

Wisconsin has a larger proportion of foreigners than any State in the Union. By the census of 1850, there were 110,471 foreigners out of an entire population of 304,756, constituting over one-third. It is estimated that now one-half of the population of the State consists of foreigners. And yet we regard Wisconsin *as the most reliable free State*, both in her popular vote and in the independence of her judiciary. In that State we received one-half of the foreign vote, which secured for us a great victory. No party, which eschewed foreigners, or treated them ungenerously, could have the remotest chance of success in that State.

In Iowa, we received two-thirds of the foreign vote, *formerly cast for democratic candidates*, for the Presidency, and without it *we should have lost the State*.

In Illinois, Fremont received one-half of the naturalized vote. He received three-fourths of the German, English, Scotch, and Protestant Irish, and all of the Scandinavians. We owe the success of our State ticket to the votes of naturalized citizens *who formerly voted with the democrats*, and,

without their aid, Fremont would have been 20,000 votes worse off than he was. *Our only hope of driving Douglas from the Senate is by keeping them fast on our side.* The aid we received from them is still more apparent when we examine the vote of Chicago. In this city there are now resident about sixty thousand foreigners and fifty thousand natives. Nearly one-half of the entire vote of the city is foreign. Last spring, in a warmly contested city election, conducted on national issues, we were unable to clear our skirts of nativism, and although we got one-fourth of the German vote, yet even with the help of the Fillmore men, we lost the city by majorities ranging from five hundred to eleven hundred, some of the foreigners voting for the less obnoxious names on the ticket and rejecting the rest. Six months later, with the liberal Philadelphia platform, and with no taint of nativism upon the party, *we achieved a victory in the city of eleven hundred majority over Buchanan and Fillmore*, notwithstanding the natives had cut loose from us, three hundred and forty-three voting for Fillmore, and *more than that number for Buchanan*. Nearly one-half of the vote by which we achieved our triumph, was made up of naturalized citizens. A comparison between Chicago and Boston is here suggested. In Boston, according to the census of 1850, there were two native born to one foreigner, while for peculiar reasons, as it is a place of temporary residence for foreigners on their first arrival in the country, the proportion of naturalized to native voters is much less than is found in a western city. In DeBow's census it is stated, that "in 1850, though the proportion of foreign born to native white in that city, was about one-half, they polled only one-eleventh as many votes." On the other hand, according to the census of 1850, there was a majority of foreigners in Chicago, a proportion still maintained. Instead of only one-eleventh of her vote being foreign as in Boston, nearly one-half is foreign. And yet Chicago has the honor of being the *only city in the United States*, with more than one hundred thousand population, which gave a majority for Fremont over Buchanan and Fillmore. *Native born citizens of Boston! hear this, and hang your heads for shame!* If your governor proposes to disfranchise those who voted against Fremont, he had better begin with the *native born citizens of Boston*, and not the naturalized voters of Chicago.

In the recent local elections in Minnesota, which have resulted in a Republican victory, the result was occasioned to a great extent by the *change* of Germans from the Democratic party (so called) to the Republicans.

In Missouri there have been rebukes administered to the slave oligarchy, for which naturalized citizens deserve great credit. Who elected that steadfast champion of freedom to Congress, Francis P. Blair, Jr., the man who, before the people of St. Louis and in the legislature of Missouri, has uniformly testified his approval of the ordinance of 1787, the Wilmot Proviso, and denounced the Nebraska Bill? He himself says that of the six thousand votes he received, *five thousand* were German naturalized citizens. There are said to be ten thousand more Germans in St. Louis than American born citizens. While the Native Americans of St. Louis have sustained Luther M. Kennett, the Missouri Republican and Border Ruffianism, the *foreigners* of that city have sustained Francis P. Blair, Jr., and the cause of *Republican Freedom*. So bitter, indeed, were the Germans towards Buchanan, Pierce, and Douglas, that there being no ticket in the State for Fremont, several thousand of them even voted for Fillmore, as the only means of making their *protest against slave extension*. The

result was, that although the United vote of Benton and Polk, the two Democratic candidates for Governor, was in St. Louis county between four and five thousand more than Ewing, the American candidate, received, yet Fillmore, a few months later, polled in that same county one thousand three hundred more votes than Buchanan. This singular disposition of the German vote accounts for the unexpectedly large vote which Fillmore received in that city.

In estimating the foreign vote given for Fremont, the statistics have been confined to the north-western States, but we may add that according to the Pittsburg Gazette, *one thousand* foreigners in that city alone voted for Fremont.

In the State of Iowa, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin and Ohio, there are a large number of German papers advocating the Republican cause, considerably more numerous than those on the side of the administration, while those which are Republican have as much larger influence and circulation as the Republican papers printed in free States in our own language generally have over those of the administration. In many instances, the German Nebraska paper only sustains a languid existence through federal patronage.

In enumerating the services of foreigners to freedom in the late struggle, we now pass from masses to prominent individuals who rendered effective aid to the cause. Of the prominent Germans, who were of any note in their fatherland, *all were on the side of freedom.* * * *

It is unnecessary to remind the people of Massachusetts that there is now resident in Boston a German, Dr. Douai, recently from Texas, *where he published for two years, at the imminent peril of personal violence, the only free-soil paper ever published in that State*, and remained there till he was driven away by the slaveholders.

The general review which has thus been made, is sustained by a particular examination of the vote of Illinois. It will be recollected that "the casting vote" in this State was given by Fillmore men, every one of whom was native-born.

* * * * *

There are one hundred counties in Illinois. From this calculation, two — Kankakee and Macon — are omitted, the former having been organized since the last census, and the number of foreigners in the latter not being reported in the census. Of the ninety-eight remaining counties, sixty-four gave pluralities for Buchanan, and thirty-four gave pluralities for Fremont. In the thirty-four counties which gave pluralities for Fremont, the aggregate vote was 68,784 for Fremont, 34,462 for Buchanan, and 5,290 for Fillmore. Adding the votes for Buchanan and Fillmore together, the vote against freedom in these counties was 39,752, which was 29,032 less than the vote for freedom. *In these counties, according to the census of 1850, there were 74,757 foreign-born persons.*

In the sixty-four counties which gave pluralities for Buchanan, the aggregate vote was 69,789 for Buchanan, 31,716 for Fillmore, and 25,430 for Fremont. Adding the votes for Buchanan and Fillmore together, the vote against freedom in these counties was 101,505, which was 75,075 more than the vote for freedom. *In these counties, according to the census of 1850, there were 37,115 foreigners, less than one-half of the number found in the Fremont counties, although the aggregate vote of the Fre-*

mont counties for all the candidates is 18,399 less than that cast by the Buchanan counties.

These contrasts become more striking when we look at the votes from another point of view. There were six counties where Fremont had five times as many votes as Buchanan, viz.: Boone, Carroll, DeKalb, Kendall, Lake and Winnebago. In these counties there were 12,768 votes for Fremont, 2,210 for Buchanan, and only 339 for Fillmore. *In these counties there were 8,845 foreigners.* On the other hand, there were twenty nine counties in which Buchanan had five times as many votes as Fremont. In these counties there were 27,333 votes for Buchanan, 11,164 for Fillmore, and only 2,068 for Fremont. *In these counties there were 4,455 foreigners.* Thus, while in counties which give five times as many votes to Fremont as to Buchanan, and give an aggregate vote for all parties of 15,317, there was 8,845 foreigners; in the twenty-nine counties which give five times as many votes to Buchanan as to Fremont, and cast an aggregate vote of 40,565 — nearly three times the aggregate vote of the five Fremont counties, — there are in these Buchanan counties only about half as many foreign-born persons.

Let us glance at the statistics from another point of view. There were fifteen counties in Illinois which gave each one more than a thousand plurality for Fremont, and sixteen which gave more than one thousand plurality each for Buchanan. We give here the votes in the first mentioned counties, with the number of foreigners in each: —

THE FREMONT COUNTIES.

<i>Counties.</i>	<i>Foreigners.</i>	<i>Fremont.</i>	<i>Buchanan.</i>	<i>Fillmore.</i>
Boone,	1,402	1,748	243	27
Bureau,	903	2,603	1,234	48
Cook,	21,863	9,020	5,680	342
DeKalb,	812	2,254	381	75
Dupage,	2,664	1,387	542	2
Henry,	811	1,924	876	47
Kane,	3,629	3,750	912	29
Kendall,	1,334	1,623	334	13
Knox,	6,89	2,851	1,490	277
Lake,	3,587	2,347	558	10
La Salle,	4,835	3,721	2,665	121
Lee,	863	1,804	601	32
Ogle,	1,137	2,469	734	289
Whiteside,	436	1,902	613	210
Winnebago,	2,273	3,636	457	61
Total,	47,238	43,038	17,320	1,583

We here give the votes of the sixteen counties which gave Buchanan over one thousand majority, with the number of foreigners in each :—

THE BUCHANAN COUNTIES.

<i>Counties.</i>	<i>Foreigners.</i>	<i>Fremont.</i>	<i>Buchanan.</i>	<i>Fillmore.</i>
Adams,	4,294	2,296	3,311	662
Franklin,	13	5	1,051	251
Greene,	461	245	1,565	719
Hamilton,	145	9	1,185	162
Jackson,	164	14	1,056	322
Jefferson,	32	60	1,278	426
Johnson,	7	2	1,144	74
Marion,	23	150	1,150	413
Pike,	798	1,053	2,163	1,16
Saline,	14	4	1,004	229
Sangamon,	1,243	1,174	2,475	1,612
Shelby,	82	152	1,414	451
Union,	67	46	1,283	246
Wayne,	86	129	1,218	402
White,	209	27	1,062	845
Williamson,	52	10	1,419	188
Total,	7,690	5,376	23,778	8,012

These tables require no comment,—they speak for themselves. The statistics already given may surprise some persons in Massachusetts, where the foreigners are generally Irish Catholics. The foreigners of the West, while including this class in large numbers, are yet composed in a larger proportion of Germans, Scandinavians, and other nations. The German emigration has distanced the Irish, and the proportion of the former is constantly increasing. A large mass of the Germans hate Catholicism more bitterly than even the Puritans of New England do, while there are some German and French Catholics, and even the most intelligent of the Catholic Irish, who, in the exercise of that independence which is native to the West, vote with the Republican party. Over one-half of the Catholic Germans of Chicago voted for Fremont.

There is one fact about foreign immigration which ought not to be forgotten. It is this which has enabled the Free States to make any stand against the Slave States. According to the census of 1850, there were 1,866,397 in the *Free States*, and only 378,205 in the *Slave States*. Including these, and the descendants of persons who have emigrated since the Constitution was framed, there were between three and four millions in the country of foreigners and the descendants of immigrants since that period. Supposing the descendants to be residing in Free or Slave States in the same proportion as the immigrants now living, this conclusion follows, that the excess of emigration to the Free States over that to the Slave States, has enabled the former to more than balance the unequal three-fifths representation of 3,204,313 slaves reported in the census, to which the latter are entitled under existing laws.

The Republican party was defeated in the presidential election, and after the defeat it is natural to seek for some one to blame. The cause is attributed to foreigners, and a policy is proposed which will drive from our ranks those who have so gallantly aided our cause. Are we strong enough to cast them away? Where shall we supply their places? Is it wise to place new issues before the public, so as to cool the ardor of any class of republicans, and compel them in self-defense to seek refuge

with the enemy? Is such a doubtful policy demanded by any public exigency? If the people of Wisconsin, one-third to one-half of whom are foreigners, do not ask it, why need the people of Massachusetts, only one-sixth of whom are foreigners, seek to force it on the country? A future is before our movement, grander than any that ever dawned on the civilization of any age. That future with its august promises, enjoins on us to be generous to all ranks, conditions and nativities, to welcome the enthusiasm of youth, to disarm conservatism of fears, to wait the progress of intelligence and truth, — and thus in the fulness of time we shall organize victory.

EDWARD L. PIERCE.

MINORITY REPORT.

The undersigned, a Minority of the Committee to whom was referred so much of the Message of His Excellency the Governor, as refers to the Right of Suffrage and the Qualification of Voters, unable to agree with the Majority in so much of their Report as recommends the passage of the Amendment relative to the Right of Suffrage, would respectfully state the reasons of their dissent.

We accord with our associates in their estimate of the evil to be obviated — so far as it can be — by State legislation. Our ballot-boxes are subject to the irruption of the ignorant, who have too often turned the scale, to the great detriment of public interests; and our public men and political parties have often been sadly corrupted by an unhallowed and rival traffic in a large political commodity, annually thrown upon our shores.

The present division of political parties in our country is based mainly upon questions of Freedom and Slavery, and whatever may have been the designs of political leaders in recently exciting a deep interest in the subject of foreign voters, there is no doubt that that interest has been intensified by the influence which these voters are supposed to exert upon the present great question of freedom at issue before the American people. And it is no less significant and instructive, than remarkable, that while, on the one side, new restrictions on foreigners are regarded as strengthening the influence of the free North, on the other side similar restrictions are sought because the foreign vote is regarded as insuring certainly to the strength of slavery and the overthrow of free institutions.

In this state of things, it is manifestly our policy and duty to act with great discrimination. While we would fain exclude from our ballot-boxes those who, through ignorance and degradation, can be bought and sold in the political shambles, and be easily led to sanction proceedings subversive of the true interests of a free country, we have no desire to exclude those whose virtuous industry and instincts determine them into the sturdiest support of freedom. While we would guard, as far as possible, against the one class, a wise statemanship forbids us to do injustice to the other, and, by that injustice, work a serious injury to ourselves.

The direct effect of our enactments begins and ends with our own Commonwealth. No act of ours can restrain evils existing elsewhere. Its influence, beyond our own limits, is merely moral and exemplary. While, therefore, we seek enactments wholesome for ourselves, we should also aim to make them only such as are wise and just in their influence upon those other communities with which our national interests are so largely identified.

The influence of Massachusetts is such that it is incumbent upon her to regard it in all that she does in such a crisis as the present. She has been, and is the foremost State of the Union, in the cause of freedom; and those who are inimical to her actions and principles, will seize upon whatever crudities or extravagances — real or alleged — may appear in her acts, and use them to the detraction and detriment of the national principles she espouses.

Under these circumstances, to act wisely, is the problem which our statemanship is called to solve. And it is sincerely to be hoped that our caution and wisdom will be found equal to our emergency and responsibility.

Naturalization is under the sole control of the General Government, which prescribes its forms and seasons. When perfected, the foreigner becomes a citizen entitled to the recognition and protection of the country. But he does not necessarily, and by virtue of his citizenship, become a voter. Each State is sovereign in determining the qualifications and conditions upon which it confers the right of suffrage, with the sole limitation that its terms shall not be inconsistent with a republican form of government. A State is competent to extend the right of suffrage, irrespective of color or even sex, irrespective of property or length of residence; or it may establish conditions based upon one or all of these. And the citizen of one State cannot, by mere force of his United States citizenship, exercise the right to vote in another State, without first being possessed of the requisites of its local laws.

While, therefore, we cannot alter or amend the laws of naturalization, which are within the sole province of the General Government, we can prescribe, in addition to United States citizenship, such further qualification of voters here as may seem best suited to our domestic welfare. And the question now arises, what further restrictions, if any, should we establish? * * *

The mere fact of foreign birth is not conclusive against the substantial qualifications of an individual to share those privileges. Ignorance and incompetency are the elements against which our enactments should be directed, and not, indiscriminately and severely, against all foreigners. Our country is an asylum for the oppressed. It opens a sphere for energies and hopes crushed out of the kingdoms of the world. And it is to the expansion of such energies and hopes upon our hospitable shores that we owe a great part, or even all of the growth, the wealth and the culture of our country. It is, therefore, alike, our policy and duty to encourage foreign immigration, not to discourage it; to welcome it by a liberal policy, and subject it to only such restrictions as are necessary and wise.

Intelligence and virtue are the pillars of our institutions, and constitute the true qualifications of an American voter; while ignorance and vice are the evils which we should restrain from a participation in our public affairs. We welcome, to rights of citizenship and suffrage, all who can appreciate, and will seek to sustain our free institutions, and would exclude only those whose ignorance converts them, at the polls, into a mere commodity to be purchased and controlled by the partisan and the demagogue. These, we apprehend, are the principles to which we should seek to conform our enactments.

Such an enactment is the constitutional amendment proposed in regard to reading and writing, as a qualification of voters. It is in the line of true policy, and has regard to the fundamental and vital principles of intelligence and virtue. And, in recommending it, we concur with your Committee.

But the amendment requiring a residence of fourteen years within the jurisdiction of the United States, from the recommendation of which, by your Committee, we dissent, seems to possess no distinct relation to what we have termed above, the line of true policy. It operates, inexorably, upon all alike. If it is our object to exclude ignorance only, the amendment, alluded to, seems to us sadly inefficient. * * *

There is no magic power in our atmosphere to endow him with intelligence by the mere length of residence. For all that, five years is as good as ten, and ten years as good as twenty or forty, and a whole life time will be found insufficient; so that, proceeding upon the principle of the amendment, an absolute exclusion of all foreign born residents from right of suffrage, (which no one seriously contemplates,) would seem not only justifiable, but more consistent and necessary. The exceptions to the above remarks, we apprehend, will be found exceedingly rare.

Moreover, the provision, even to its intended extent, is of uncertain operation. The proof is not required of fourteen years' residence in our own State, the fact of which might be easy of certain proof, but of fourteen years' residence within the

jurisdiction of the United States. Perjuries, to any extent, and beyond the possibility of detection, may and will be committed, under the influence and inducements of political partisans, upon the eve of an exciting election. The classes of those who have professedly been here for fourteen years, will astonishingly increase; the political shambles will be speedily filled, and the political traffic will become as tempting, scandalous and corrupt as ever. * * *

The length of residence necessary to qualify a foreign voter, should date from, and be subsequent to, the period of his full citizenship — a matter so easy of proof that deception is almost impossible. The United States government makes citizens; the State makes voters. Where the action of the General Government ends, is the natural place for ours to begin.

But the Amendment reported by the committee disregards this plain and just principle. Instead of a moderate and ascertainable length of residence, it gives the foreigner the advantage of one so long as to be ascertainable only with great difficulty, if at all, and thereby offers a premium upon deception and perjury; the very present evils we wish to avoid. * * *

We object, then, to the Amendment we are discussing, because it is anomalous and unsafe in the following particulars: —

1. In not requiring the residence to be *subsequent* to citizenship;
2. Because so uncertain in its operation, and its terms so little susceptible of proof; and
3. Because its operation being equally exclusive of all, and having no practical effect to discriminate in favor of intelligence and against ignorance, fails to conform with our wisest policy.

Indeed, it seems to us, with the best intent on the part of its framers, with which we fully sympathize, and which we rejoice to see existing, the Amendment was framed to give a hasty and impulsive expression to a truthful sentiment, but without the reflection and careful discrimination which the magnitude of the subject, and the interests at stake demand. Therefore, it is such as will be found to be not only inefficient for good, but really subversive of the ends proposed. And we do earnestly desire, for the good of our Commonwealth, and for the credit of its legislative and popular sagacity, no such error as this shall become a part of the fundamental law of this State.

The proposed Amendment fails to discern the only time and place at which the political evil can be met, and at which the remedy can be most effectually applied. It is upon the eve of important elections that the political traffic in foreign votes is most assiduously and effectively prosecuted. It is then that the political parties are fully organized, and hundreds of voters are manufactured, at the expense of those parties, to be used for the emergency; very few of whom would become naturalized of their own accord, especially if the opportunity of exercising the elective franchise was somewhat remote.

As illustrating this, we have hastily gathered a few facts, regretting that time is not allowed us to glean those of a similar nature from all parts of the State. We turn to the county of Suffolk, and ascertain through court records, the following facts concerning foreigners naturalized in the exciting presidential campaigns of 1848, 1852, and 1856: —

1848.	Whole number naturalized, was,.....	611
	In September,.....	61
	After October 1, to the November election,....	329
	After 1st September,.....	390
	More than half of the whole number after October 1, and nearly two-thirds after the 1st September.	
1852.	Whole number,.....	1,449
	In September,.....	177
	After October 1, prior to November election,.....	613
	After September 1, (more than half,).....	790

1856. Whole number,	3,318
In September,	698
After October 1, prior to November election,	1,721

More than two-thirds after September 1, + 2,419

More than half after the 1st of October.

No comment is needed to show how crowded the political shambles become with both buyers and sellers on the eve of an election. The excess of numbers in October over those in September, indicates the ratio of pressure as the day of election draws nigh. That these proportions are not confined to the populous County of Suffolk is indicated by the returns we have procured from Hampshire County, which we present as a sample of the rural portions of the Commonwealth. We take the same years, as follows:—

1848. Whole number,	31
One month before election, one-half,	15
1852. Whole number,	17
One month before election, two-thirds,	11
1856. Whole number,	69
One month before election, (nearly two-thirds,)	42
One week before election, nearly one-third,	20

An evil connected with this crowding for naturalization papers, upon the eve of elections, should be specially noticed. When the applicants are scattered along through the year, leisure is allowed to investigate the cases as they arise, to cross-examine and to require further proof; in consequence of which, we are informed, are frequent rejections. But when they come crowding in, at the eleventh hour, as we are assured they do come by the hundreds in the County of Suffolk, the examinations must be hasty and formal—confined to a routine of questions which are readily answered as the deponents are disposed, or instructed to do. No time is allowed for careful investigation, and very many are slipped through, under this culminating pressure which so clearly and strongly favors the designs of their political purchasers.

The foregoing facts indicate, beyond a doubt, the point of attack upon the corruption incident to the foreign vote. A remedy adapted to the emergency should apply, with its main force, directly here; and, applied here, it can be rendered more efficient, and practically, more discriminating between the degraded and the intelligent foreigner, than any other remedy that suggests itself.

The required length of residence should date from the final papers. * * * If the foreigner is required to reside “within the jurisdiction of the United States” two years, (one of which, by an existing provision of the Constitution, must be in this State) after becoming fully naturalized, before he is admitted to the right of suffrage, the rule will work no obnoxious hindrance to the intelligent immigrant. If the time is one year, he is so far on a footing with a native born immigrant from another State. And, if the time should be two years, he will not feel it to be a heavy and unreasonable burden. So that, while admission to the right of suffrage is made reasonable and satisfactory to the immigrant who has appreciation enough of the value of citizenship, and forecast enough to secure his papers, it will, practically, be of little avail to that degraded and shifting class which press into our court rooms on the eve of an election. They have neither appreciation or forecast enough to purchase their naturalization papers for a prospective use, and thus absorb the means which they prefer to lavish in other indulgences; and the motive of political organizations to persuade them into court and pay them through, is removed, when the political use that can be made of them is remote and uncertain. The politician will not know, one, two, or three years in advance, where either he or the article he purchases will be when the day of use arrives.

Moreover, such a provision as we have suggested, together with the Amendment concerning reading and writing, is in the line of a wise policy, inasmuch as the

direct effect of the one, and the indirect but sure effect of the other, is to discriminate against ignorance, and to favor intelligence on the part of those who are candidates for naturalization.

Another objection to the Amendment is, that its indiscriminate stringency is untimely, with reference to the character of the immigration which is now coming to our shores. We have received the great bulk of the more ignorant, and have borne the burden of their incorporation into the body politic. Their labor, fortunately, has added immensely to our material wealth, while their political weight has been heavy to bear. It would have been wise to have restrained their right of suffrage hitherto, and it is well and important to restrain it now by some wise and efficient means. But, at the very moment that the character of foreign immigrants is vastly improving, when we are receiving those from Germany and Switzerland, who come with understanding in their heads, instincts of freedom in their hearts and money in their pockets, we should be specially cautious lest, in attempting to curtail a great evil which is naturally and necessarily decreasing, we do not also shut out a great good, and by excessive rigor convert our natural friends into unnatural enemies. Such an effect we think, the Amendment reported by your Committee would be likely to produce; that, while practically inefficient, its spirit will be obnoxious to the growing class of intelligent immigrants. They will not fail to perceive that our enactments place them, in the political scale, below the negro who chances to leave his bondage. He attains, in one short year, a right of suffrage which an intelligent German or Hungarian, or even a peer of England, must wait fourteen years to obtain. How can such a provision be otherwise than offensive to the very class of persons whom justice and interest alike demand we should receive and adopt without needless restraints. And the repulsive effect it may have upon the large number of foreign-born citizens who are now influential at the ballot boxes of the country, is worthy of a passing thought, and should lead wise men to weigh its merits and efficiency well, ere they adopt it as a part of the fundamental law of this Commonwealth.

That the character of immigration to this State is improving, is apparent from the fact that about one-half of the arrivals, for the last year, have been from the British Provinces. That it is improving generally throughout the country, is also apparent from the great proportionate increase of coin brought with the immigrants who arrive at the city of New York. * * *

We feel confidence in the favorable disposition of the legislature to adopt an amendment embodying the sentiments and views set forth in this Report. Such an amendment we respectfully submit herewith in words following, to wit:

No person, hereafter naturalized in this Commonwealth, in conformity with the laws of the United States, shall have the right to vote, or to hold office, until two years subsequent to his legal naturalization aforesaid.

ERASTUS HOPKINS,
OLIVER AMES JR.,
ROBERT A. COFFIN,
PAUL COUCH,
GEO. NORWOOD,
LORENZO H. RICE,
OLIVER WARNER.